

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,023	12/16/2003	William G. Hartman	AVERP3350USA	5575
7590 10/10/2006			EXAMINER	
Heidi A. Boehlefeld			LAM, ANN Y	
Renner, Otto, B	oisselle & Sklar, LLP	·		
Nineteenth Floo	r		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1621 Euclid Av	enue		1641	
Cleveland, OH	44115-2191		DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006	ó

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/737,023	HARTMAN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ann Y. Lam	1641					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet v	with the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status		•					
1)⊠ ·Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 £	December 2003.						
, .	s action is non-final.						
•—	<i>7</i>						
closed in accordance with the practice under							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) 1-48 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers	·						
	•						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examino	· ·	hutho Everiner					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•	•					
The oath of declaration is objected to by the E	xammer. Note the attache	ed Office Action of John F 10-132.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	ot received.					
\							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: _						

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: a) a detecting system comprising detector antibodies (claims 2-4, 14-17, 34-40); b) a detecting system comprising a dye (claim 7); a detecting system comprising a metal-complex (claims 5 and 6); a detecting system comprising a conductive ink layer (claim 33). The related species are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect. In the instant case, the species are mutually exclusive and are not obvious variants. The species have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect because each species comprise different elements for detection and thus operate differently. It is noted that a dye or a metal-complex does not necessarily require detector antibodies, and detector antibodies do not necessarily require a dye or a metal-complex (nor are they disclosed as such in the specification).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required one species is not required for the other species, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 5-13, 18-33 and 41-48 are generic as to the type of detector system.

Page 3

2. Upon election of a species of detector system, Applicant must further elect from the following species. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: 1) the analytes as listed in claims 22 and 23; and 2) the analytes as listed in claim 24.

It is noted that while claims 22 and 23 list a variety of analyte, Examiner will prosecute those analytes if group 1) is elected, as it does not appear burdensome. However, group 1) and group 2) are restricted out because group 1) and group 2) are notably different and appear burdensome.

The related species are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect. In the instant case, the species are mutually exclusive and are not obvious variants. The species have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect because each species comprise different analytes to be detected (group 1) relate to biological analytes; and group 2) relate to non-biological analytes), and thus operate differently.

Art Unit: 1641

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required one species is not required for the other species, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-21 and 25-48 are generic as to the type of analytes.

3. Applicant must further elect from the following species. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the types of absorbent listed in the Markush group in claim 12.

The related species are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect. In the instant case, the species are mutually exclusive and are not obvious variants. The species have a materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect because each species comprise different chemical compounds and thus are structurally and functionally different.

Art Unit: 1641

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required one species is not required for the other species, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-11 and 13-48 are generic as to the type of absorbent.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Art Unit: 1641

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Heidi Boehlefeld on September 5, 2006 and September 18, 2006, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 10-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1641

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.